



DATE: September 23, 2015

AGENDA ITEM # 2

TO: Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Commission

FROM: Cedric Novenario, Staff Liaison

SUBJECT: Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation Schedule

RECOMMENDATION:

Discuss a Pedestrian Master Plan Implementation Schedule

BACKGROUND

On August 25, 2015, the City Council approved the Pedestrian Master Plan (PMP). The plan was well received by the Council, however, it was requested that staff and the BPAC consider developing an implementation schedule of the identified projects in Chapter 7.

DISCUSSION

Chapter 7 separates the proposed improvements into high, medium, and low priority tables, as well as their associated estimates. See Tables 7-6 through 7-8. These projects were screened based on the prioritization criteria which evaluated: safety, public involvement/support, ease of implementation, gap closure, proximity to schools, parks, and community centers, nexus with existing/proposed bikeway, livability/multimodal synergy and the pedestrian suitability index. Tables 7-6 through 7-8 include the prioritization criteria score for each project. The projects were not ranked by score; rather they were grouped by geographic region. This was done to provide the City flexibility to implement projects as funding and partnership opportunities become available.

Given the direction of the Council, one option in developing an implementation schedule is to simply rank the projects by score. This prioritizes the projects and infers that they will be addressed in rank order.

The next component of an implementation schedule is funding availability. Most pedestrian infrastructure improvements in the city have been constructed with state or regional grant funds. Some city funds were also used as a grant “match,” typically around 12% as a condition of the grant. These funds come in the form of general funds and Traffic Impact Fees. As you are aware, the city applied for the second round of the Active Transportation Grant (ATP) which consisted of projects on the High Priority Table, and those that affect

schools. The Table 7-6 attachment identifies which projects were submitted as part of the ATP. These projects were programmed into the five-year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) budget starting this past July. We will not know the outcome of the ATP grant until later this year at the earliest.

Below are example grant funds and their approximate grant cycles:

- ATP – every 2 years, competitive
- Transportation Development Act (TDA) Article III – every year, relative small amount distributed based on population
- One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) – every 2 years, 2-funding pots, 1-competitive and 1-distributed based on population. The second round of OBAG is currently being developed with an expected call for projects in 2016.

Since several projects have been submitted to ATP round 2, perhaps one suggestion in developing a prioritization schedule is to assign projects based on anticipated grant call-for-projects cycles.

Staff welcomes a discussion regarding the proposed implementation schedules stated above and/or a discussion on alternative methods in developing an implementation schedule.

Attachments:

1. Project Priority Tables 7-6 to 7-8